July 19, 2000
10:30 AM - 11:30 AM
MAG Office Building
302 North 1ˢᵗ Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona

ATTENDANCE

Sarath Joshua, MAG, Project Manager	Alan Sanderson, City of Mesa
Jim Book, City of Glendale, Chairman	Scott Nodes, City of Peoria
Rudy Kolaja, ADOT	Joel Havris, City of Phoenix
Mary Kihl, ASU	Bob Ciotti, Phoenix Transit
Brian Latte, City of Chandler	Jim Decker, City of Tempe
Bruce Ward, Town of Gilbert	Don Dey, TransCore
Dale Thompson, MCDOT	

PROJECT TEAM

Pierre Pretorius, Kimley-Horn and Associates	David Haines, Kimley-Horn and Associates
Tom Fowler, Kimley-Horn and Associates	

1.   Project Introduction and Welcome
     Chairman Jim Book called the meeting to order at 10:30 AM.

2.   Approval of RISG Meeting No. 7 Minutes
     Chairman Jim Book asked if there were any comments or corrections to the RISG Meeting No. 8
     minutes. There were no comments or corrections and the minutes were approved.

3.   Progress Report

     3.1 Task 13, ITS Training and Capacity Building Plan
     The final version of Technical Memorandum No. 9, ITS Training and Capacity Building Plan,
     was distributed to the RISG.

     3.2 Task 12, ITS Evaluation Plan
     The final version of Technical Memorandum No. 8, ITS Evaluation Plan, was distributed to the
     RISG.

     3.3 Task 9, Operational and Implementation Strategies
     Pierre Pretorius provided a slide presentation to explain the comments that have been received by
     the RISG and the changes that are being considered for the Technical Memoranda for Operational
     and Implementation Strategies, ITS Telecommunications Plan, and ITS Implementation Plan. A
     handout of the slides and the proposed changes to these Technical Memoranda was provided to
     the RISG for their review and comment.

     Changes that have been made to Technical Memorandum No. 6A, Operational and
     Implementation Strategies, based on comments from the RISG were presented. A new table

entitled Agency System Responsibilities will be included in the Technical Memorandum No. 6A and was distributed to the RISG for review.

An example of the Future Institutional Arrangements Diagram that was originally presented in Technical Memorandum No. 5, MAG Regional ITS Architecture, was also distributed to the RISG for review. Pierre mentioned that there have been comments regarding the Operations Working Group and whether it is appropriate to include this group in the institutional arrangements. Pierre stated that Kimley-Horn has not changed the diagram and suggested that the MAG ITS Committee should further discuss the diagram to determine if it should be changed or left as it was originally presented in Technical Memorandum No. 5.

The RISG was asked to provide final comments to Sarath Joshua on Technical Memorandum No. 6A, Operational and Implementation Strategies, by Friday, July 28, 2000.

3.4 Task 11, ITS Telecommunications Plan
Changes that have been made to Technical Memorandum No. 7, ITS Telecommunications Plan, based on comments from the RISG were presented and a revised ITS telecommunications plan map was distributed. Chairman Jim Book asked if conduit that individual cities own should be shown on the map. David Haines replied that empty conduit was not shown in individual cities on the ITS telecommunications map but was described in description of each city. Unless the conduit includes fiber, or it could serve as a route to connect a traffic management center to the regional fiber hub, it will not be included on the map. Chairman Book will revise the map in the Glendale area and provided changes to David Haines.

The RISG was asked to provide final comments to Sarath Joshua on Technical Memorandum No. 7, ITS Telecommunications Plan, by Friday, July 28, 2000.

3.5 Task 10, ITS Implementation Plan
Changes that have been made to Technical Memorandum No. 6B, ITS Implementation Plan, based on comments from the RISG were presented. A copy of the revised Short-term Implementation Plan was presented to the RISG for review.

Pierre Pretorius stated that ADOT had indicated that traffic interchange signals will no longer be integrated with FMS. Several cities expressed that they are already doing signal timing at traffic interchanges independent of ramp metering.

Alan Sanderson had provided a comment regarding the inclusion of a project for signal coordination. It was his belief that signal coordination should be an on-going responsibility of all agencies and not require a separate project. Brian Latte responded that several jurisdictions had received funding to do interjurisdictional signal timing improvements in the I-10/Ahwatukee/Chandler area and this was helpful. It was proposed that the project remain in the Short-term Implementation Plan as SMART Corridor/interjurisdictional signal timing improvements.

The Valley Metro projects that are currently (or will soon be) in the RFP stage have been added to the Short-term Implementation Plan, however cost estimates were not available. Bob Ciotti stated that he could provide cost estimates to the Kimley-Horn Team.

A project has been included in the Short-term, Mid-term, and Long-term Implementation Plan for project evaluation. This will require that 5 percent of the budget for every ITS project in the

MAG TIP is set aside and pooled together for project evaluations. The committee discussed how the use of matching funds for evaluation will affect the CMAQ matching requirement. Further investigation is needed to determine exactly how the process will work, but the RISG agreed that the MAG ITS Committee should continue pursuing project evaluation.

The MAG ITS Committee project prioritization process was further described in the ITS Implementation Plan and maps indicating the ITS priority areas as designated by each city were distributed. Sarath indicated that the ITS priority area maps were documented so that they could not be changed each year to take advantage of the project prioritization scoring process. Chairman Jim Book questioned if each city was consistent in determining their ITS priority areas. Some cities had indicated priority areas based on the greatest need for funding, while others indicated the areas with the greatest congestion and traffic demands. Jim Decker indicated that a City Council may change the priority areas of a city and did not agree with the decision that the ITS priority area maps can not be changed. To resolve the discussion, it was decided that in the ITS Strategic Plan Update will include a description of the MAG ITS project prioritization process but the ITS priority area maps will not be included.

The RISG was asked to provide final comments to Sarath Joshua on Technical Memorandum No. 6B, ITS Implementation Plan, by Friday, July 28, 2000.

4.   <u>Next Meeting</u>
The next meeting will take place on **Wednesday, August 16, 2000 at 10:00 AM** following the MAG ITS Committee meeting. The agenda will include the distribution of the Draft Executive Report and the Draft Final Report.

5.   <u>Adjournment</u>
The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 AM.